

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/521,367	03/08/2000	Hitoshi Karasawa	00146/LH	9961		
75	7590 01/12/2004			EXAMINER		
Frishauf Holtz Goodman Langer & Chick PC			ROBERTS, PAUL A			
767 Third Aven New York, NY			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER			
			3731	:1		
			DATE MAILED: 01/12/2004	1 1		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	ON
Advisory Action	09/521,367	KARASAWA, HITOSI	HI
·	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul A Roberts	3731	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addre	9SS
THE REPLY FILED 11 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in the contract which the contract which are the contract with the contract which are the contract which are the contract which are the contract with the contract which are the contract w	cation. A proper replich places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extent the final Office action; or (2	nsion fee under 2) as set forth in
<ul><li>1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>11 December 2003</u>.</li><li>37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI</li></ul>	Appellant's Brief must be filed R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	I within the period se of the appeal.	t forth in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \( \square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claim	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		separate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		to issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3, 5, 8, 10-18, 24, 25.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 19-23.			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	1
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		1//
10. Other: See attached sheet and interview summary		MICHAEL J. MI SUPERVISORY PATENT TECHNOLOGY CENT	EXAMINER

Application/Control Number: 09/521,367

Art Unit: 3731

Regarding the rejection in the Office action of 6/13/03 under U.S.C. 112 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, the amendment filed 12/11/03 obviates that rejection.

Regarding the rejection in the Office action of 6/13/03 under U.S.C. 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, the applicant's amendment of the specification is adequate to remedy the problem with the three terms in question. However, this error was made numerous times throughout the claims. In other words, there other terms, (which were not specifically pointed out) which have this same problem. The applicant was asked to check each term in the claims and ensure it is recited in the specification. Applicant should do this for all pending and withdrawn claims. Applicant is encouraged to make the same type of specification amendment as he did in the amendment of 12/11/03. The applicant's amendment of 12/11/03 has not completely complied with this requirement. Another example of this error is the 'opening' of claim 1. The 'opening' is believed to be the 'internal space' in the specification.

Page 2